



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/824,766

04/13/2004

Randy L. Rummel

DYCOOK.015C1

6739

20995 7590 10/18/2007
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

BASICHAS, ALFRED

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3749

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/18/2007

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

HT

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/824,766	Applicant(s) RUMMEL ET AL.	
	Examiner Alfred Basichas	Art Unit 3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 26-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Gilliom (4,108,139), which appears to disclose substantially all of the claimed limitations, including among other things,

*26. An oven 10 comprising: an oven cavity 17; a fan compartment 50 adjacent a wall 20 of the oven cavity and housing a **centrifugal** fan 51 therein; a combustion box 35 located below the fan compartment **and at least a portion of a wall 39 (see at least fig. 2) separating the combustion box from the oven cavity not being insulated**; a tube-type gas burner 32 located adjacent and parallel (see at least fig. 3) to a front wall 31 of the combustion box, the front wall of the combustion box being proximate a front 21 of the oven cavity; a flue spout 39 configured to provide fluid communication between the combustion box and an inlet portion of the fan compartment (see at least fig. 2).*

27. *The oven of Claim 26, wherein a portion 41,57 of the inlet portion is open to the oven cavity.*
28. *The oven of Claim 26, further comprising openings 58 formed in a bottom wall of the oven separating the oven cavity from the combustion box (see at least fig. 1).*
29. *The oven of Claim 26, wherein a bottom wall of the combustion box comprises a rearward upward slope 37 (see at least fig. 2).*
30. *The oven of Claim 26, wherein the combustion box comprises a plurality of air inlet holes 58.*
31. *The oven of Claim 26, wherein the flue spout covers substantially the entire inlet portion of the fan compartment (see at least fig. 2).*
32. *The oven of Claim 26, wherein the flue spout covers at least half of the inlet portion of the fan compartment (see at least fig. 2).*
- Gilliom further shows a baffle plate 42 with a centrally positioned inlet 57, a portion of the oven back wall 20 forms a portion of the fan compartment (see at least fig. 2) with multiple fan outlets (see at least fig. 3), a plurality of primary and secondary combustion holes 66,70.**

Applicants have added a substantial number of claims directed to various locations of components. Where differences occur between the newly claimed invention and the invention disclosed by Gilliom, such differences appear to be a matter of design choice based on spatial considerations. In view of the absence of criticality for this particular design, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate it into the invention disclosed by Gilliom, so as to provide for spatial considerations.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claim amendment have been considered but not deemed persuasive.

a. Applicant asserts that not insulating a portion of a wall is not a matter of design choice. The examiner disagrees. In designing ovens the engineer must make a choice based on manufacturing costs regarding materials such as insulation, as well as the placement thereof.

b. Applicant further asserts that the prior art fails to show openings in the bottom wall, but ignores elements 58 as recited in the rejection above.

c. Applicant further asserts that the prior art fails to show a plurality of inlet holes, but ignores elements 58 as recited in the rejection above.

d. Applicant further asserts that the prior art fails to show a multiple mode oven. In response to applicant's arguments, this recitation has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

e. Applicant further asserts that the prior art fails to show the fan inlet positioned centrally in the baffle plate. Applicant appears to have completely

ignored the rejection and the "highlighted" portion that specifically recites "**a baffle plate 42 with a centrally positioned inlet 57.**"

f. Applicant further asserts that the prior art fails to show an upward sloping bottom wall portion in the combustion box. Applicant's attention is directed to at least element 38 in fig. 2.

g. Applicant further asserts that the prior art fails to show a plurality of secondary combustion holes. Again, applicant appears to have completely ignored the rejection and the "highlighted" portion that specifically **recites "a plurality of primary and secondary combustion holes 66,70."**

h. Applicant further asserts that the prior art fails to show the combustion box positioned substantially centrally under the oven bottom wall. Applicant's attention is directed to at least figs. 1, 2, or 3.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3749

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 571 272 4871. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center telephone number is 571 272 3700.

October 15, 2007


Alfred Basichas
Primary Examiner